

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
ASHEVILLE DIVISION
CRIMINAL CASE NO. 1:20-cr-00060-MR-WCM-1**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMANDA DALE TRULL,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the Defendant's Amended Joint Motion to Seal Memorandum in Support of Motion to Continue [Doc. 24].

The Defendant, through counsel, moves the Court for leave to file a Memorandum in Support of Joint Motion to Continue Sentencing Hearing [Docs. 23], under seal in this case. For grounds, counsel states that the memorandum includes detailed sensitive information not suitable for the public record. [Doc. 24 at 1]. The Defendant further represents that the Government joins in the Motion to Seal. [Id. at 2].

Before sealing a court document, the Court must "(1) provide public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, and (3) provide specific reasons and factual findings supporting

its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives.” Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc., 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000). In the present case, the public has been provided with adequate notice and an opportunity to object to the Defendant’s amended motion. The Defendant filed her amended motion on February 8, 2021, and it has been accessible to the public through the Court’s electronic case filing system since that time. Further, the Defendant has demonstrated that the Memorandum contains sensitive information and that the public’s right of access to such information is substantially outweighed by the Defendant’s competing interest in protecting the details of such information. See United States v. Harris, 890 F.3d 480, 492 (4th Cir. 2018). Finally, having considered less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, the Court concludes that sealing of the Memorandum is necessary to protect the Defendant’s privacy interests.

Accordingly, the Defendant’s Amended Motion to Seal [Doc. 24] is granted, and counsel shall be permitted to file a Memorandum under seal.


With respect to the Defendant’s amended motion requesting the withdrawal of her previously filed Motion to Seal [Doc. 22 (sealed)], the Court finds for the reasons stated in the amended motion, and for good cause shown, sufficient grounds to allow withdrawal of the previously filed motion.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Defendant's Amended Joint Motion to Seal Memorandum in Support of Motion to Continue [Doc. 24] is **GRANTED**, and the Defendant's Memorandum in Support of Joint Motion to Continue Sentencing Hearing [Docs. 23] shall be filed under seal and shall remain under seal until further Order of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant's request to withdraw the previously filed Motion to Seal [Doc. 22 (sealed)] is hereby **ALLOWED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: February 13, 2021



Martin Reidinger
Chief United States District Judge

